



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

EJECTIVE PHILOSOPHY.

By THOS. P. BAILEY, Jr., Fellow at Clark University.

Empiricism and intuitionism have always been foes: the one abhors "subjectivity" without a history, the other despises uncritical "mechanism." Yet both these philosophic attitudes (for schools they are not) claim to rely on experience; and their claims are just. Both admit that there are sensations and relations between sensations. The mechanically minded see in sensations *the real* mind-stuff, and defiantly ask, what would become of your relations, your intuitions, if their terms were taken away? You acknowledge that you *feel intuitions*, but are not those feelings the practical results (for life and conduct) of the workings of the psychical mechanism? Even admitting that feeling is primary, how could you have cognitive intuitions if you did not have language, which is a sensational symbolism at bottom? It is anthropomorphism that makes you feel that a cause *produces* an effect. To be a logical believer in causation, you must see powers working in all natural successions. But the intuitionist replies: Principles are the important things in life and mind, and sensations are but the handles whereby we may catch hold of intuitions. The genesis and the dressing of an idea determine nothing as to its validity. The practical results are ends, and the psychological mechanism is a means. Language necessarily has a sensational dress, for it appeals to the ear and the eye. But how about gesture and facial expression and the inherent grammatical categories which are the substance of which language is the shadow! You may slur the "ifs" and "buts" and "therefores," but you cannot *think* without them. You cannot explain away cause, because you cannot transcend your experience. You cannot annihilate reason without annihilating your cock-sure empiricism. Why has not the foolish belief in causation been annihilated by "natural selection?" You had better not talk about anthropomorphism while the sword of the idealist is bared. And so they have cried "come again!" at each other through the rolling centuries. I give merely samples of the fence-play. But Berkeley, the idealist, was a man of faith, and Herbart, the empiricist, fought utilitarianism so keenly as to stab at its masked face in the categorical Kant! How humanly precious is inconsistency in philosophy! These naïve contradictions between theory and practice, logic and instinct, have for some time been foreshadowing the larger view of a biological and anthropological philosophy. Many of the old issues are dead or dying. The empiricists are learning some lessons: However "derived," relations are now instinctive and are the most valuable of mental things; language had cognitive implications from the start, and its growth has been in a cognitive direction, however much the sensational "terms" may vary; let us hold to a chastened anthropomorphism lest the idealist and the materialist destroy us—we can think of matter only in terms of mind, and of mind only in terms of matter (Spencer); perhaps we had better ease up a little on the "prin-

ciple of relativity"—the biologically-minded have given us the better principle of fatigue, the discovery of hot and cold spots, the phenomena of monoideistic trance, etc.; the probability that there are pleasure and pain-fibers render the "theory of relativity" too metaphysical, and empiricists must beware of metaphysics, at least old metaphysics. The intuitionists have also learned some lessons: Relations are not degraded by having pedigrees; empiricists are often neither fools nor knaves; physiology and biology are magnificent allies; perhaps it is better not to dogmatize too much about the origin of languages, especially as we know so little about non-Aryan tongues, the North American Indian language Stocks, for instance; the empiricist is unable to do any harm in his efforts to disprove causation; let us allow him to jump out of his own skin if he wants to; on the other hand, let us beware of entangling alliances with the idealist, who insists that his skin is not spacial in *essentia*, for the true intuitionist cannot afford to part with common sense; perhaps foolish beliefs may be inherited because they are useful—perhaps we need a *critique of pure instinct*. We even begin to find a few intuitionists that study Herbert Spencer *sympathetically*, and an occasional empiricist that has patience with the Scottish school of philosophy. But the old issue is still before us—sight *versus* faith, sensation *versus* intuition. The trend of the best equipped and most earnest minds of today is, I think, toward instinct as the starting point, and the criterion of philosophical activity. Then have the intuitionists won? The criterion, but not the method. The empiricists have lacked faith in instinct, but they have had faith in sight. Now the method of science is to express relations in terms of quantitative sensations. Impossible as it is to weigh and measure faith, hope and charity, it is possible to objectivize, to sensationalize, or at least to symbolize in terms of the biological sciences our psychological and philosophical knowledge. Shall not philosophy express her faith in terms of sight?

As is the psychology, so is the philosophy. Philosophy is the science of the sciences; it is the unifying, or, better still, integrating science. Psychology (in the widest sense) is the mental science corresponding to the physical sciences. Whatever else the terms of philosophy may denote, they certainly *must* represent facts of normal experience. Logical puzzles and word-mongering are not philosophy. The time for seeking *noumena* has passed, for phenomena are noumena, but there are phenomena *and* phenomena. Thinkers discriminate the relative and the absolute in experience: and psychology is the science of experience. But what sort of psychology? That which accepts *all* the facts of experience, does not try to explain away any class of facts, does not accuse the human race of ineradicable illusion, has no metaphysical (materialistic or traditional) theory to sustain; but which uses mechanical hypotheses wherever it can, does not worry itself about whether brain explains mind, or whether mind explains brain, interprets the results of trained and of untrained introspection, by means of objective symbols and analyses, expresses the laws of mental operations in terms of mechanism, and the validity of mental relations in terms of spontaneity. Such a psychology finds itself at home in brain-psychology and in abstract ethics, without confounding the sciences or dividing nature. Spiritualists and materialists, idealists and realists, pantheists and theists must all appeal to it, or be condemned to the nebulousness of an unscientific metaphysic. Philosophy must have a valid psychological starting point, a psychological standard and a psychological criterion. Shall we start with "sensation," or "intuition," or "feeling" (!), or "volition"? In my opinion, the

starting point is muscular strain; the standard is impulse; the criterion is catholic *human* instinct, but I must try to justify this opinion.

It seems almost like sacrilege to question the tripartite or trilogical division of mind into "intellect, feeling and will." Without attacking the time-honored division, let us adopt another for the sake of convenience. Mental facts are of two kinds: the ejective and the effective. The ejective includes sensation and relation (intuition); effective includes impulse and emotion. Sensation is of two kinds: affective (pleasure and pain), and objective (the "six senses"). Relation is of three kinds: automatic, as time, space, number, etc. (the concepts of time, space, etc., are not here referred to); reflex = biological, psychical, social = *animal* (including *homo sapiens*) instincts relation; intuitive = æsthetical, logical, ethical = human instinct relation. Turning now to the effective, impulse is muscular feeling with a trend toward outwardness (away from diffused subjectivity), activity in a definite direction, integration for an end. Emotion is muscular feeling with a trend toward inwardness (away from definite objectivity), reaction in a (mentally) indefinite direction, segregation for recuperation. Now, how is muscular feeling the starting point of philosophy?

Movement is the end of mind as motion is the end of matter. Matter is a "permanent possibility," not of "sensation," but of motion. Mind is a "permanent possibility," not of "having sensation," but of movement (muscular feeling). In the reflex arc the sense-organ and the nerve-centre exist for the muscular contraction. In character, knowing and "feeling" exist for doing and the capacity for doing. Muscular feeling underlies attention, resolution, determination, spontaneity; benevolence, justice, equity; infinity, eternity, absoluteness; force, power, might; personality, institutions, history. Our minds are "active" or "passive;" we "form" opinions and "diffuse" knowledge; blind deaf-mutes get along nicely with but a single *representative* sense. In the lower animals, sensations are but guides to muscularity. In us, sensations and cognitions and pleasures and pains mean nothing to us if we are debarred from bodily and mental activity and rest. Matter is symbolized force; force is objective energy (muscularity), however much you de-anthropomorphize yourself, until you call it P and put it in a formula. We cannot get rid of foot pounds and horse powers either in physics or psychology. Physics has adopted units of force, has psychology adopted units of energy? The reflex arc! Yes, and the muscular end of it. There is but one valid psychophysic fact, the contraction of a muscle *with* the feeling of muscular strain. In this phenomenon, energy is force, force is energy. The power (not noumenon) "behind phenomena" is at least energy-force. What are beauty and truth and right apart from attraction! Says Prof. Lloyd Morgan very truly and very nobly, "Knowledge and art are justified by their influence on conduct; truth and beauty must ever guide us toward right living, and æsthetics is true or false according as it leads toward a higher or lower standard of moral life."¹ Wherever our ideals may lead us, they *lead* us, and we follow.

Muscular feeling is (1) immediate, (2) objectively based in muscular contraction, (3) combines diffusion with localization, (4) makes subjective and objective integration (in consciousness) possible, (5) is the origin of the objectively projected idea of Force (the Force-schema), of the subjectively injected idea of Energy,

¹ *Springs of Conduct*, p. 263.

Might (the Energy-schema), of the ejective idea of Power (the Personality schema); (6) it is neuro-muscular—it is involved in and necessary to (a) sensation (localization, intensity, local signs), (b) impulse (outgoing energy), (c) emotion (interacting energy), (d) feeling (pleasure, pain, reaction, satisfaction), (e) relation (subject-object attitude). Yet (for one can dogmatize about opinions), let him be anathema who "evolves" sensation, relation, impulse and emotion "out of" muscular feeling. An "emotion" may be a mental attitude involving all "elements." I choose to limit the term to effective, reactive, reflex muscular. Muscular feeling ought to be the starting point of psychology and philosophy, because it is the raw stuff of activity throughout the mental sphere, and makes possible an appreciation of the outer world of force. Activity must be guided, and its guidance is all important, but we start with the activity itself.

Impulse is the psychological and philosophical standard. Having decided to start with the effective side of the mental life, we shall find ourselves called on to choose a standard of mental currency. Relations may control the flow of our mental money, may adjust supply to demand, may determine amount of reserve fund and kind of investment, but there must be coin of the realm in plenty, and into which mental paper is easily convertible. Shall we choose as the standard, impulse or emotion? Unquestionably impulse. It most nearly represents irritability; it is the effective side of primary instincts; it stands for definiteness, coherence, integration; it is the basis of will and of work. We have needs ("striving impulses"), our active impulses satisfy those needs of objects and of exercise. Emotion is reactive and secondary; its primary function seems to be the reflex overcoming of the inhibition of normal activity. Apart from instinctive outbreaks, emotion in man seems to be acquiring a segregating, recuperative function, and to be more and more characteristic of play as opposed to work. (What we value in an emotion is the intuition, the relation, in it.) Its pathologic tendencies are many and various; emotional characters never become integrated. You can play upon them as on the strings of a harp. Emotions are represented and accompanied in the ejective sphere by pleasure and pain, and are guided by the self-relations. When limited to the function of recuperation, and when recuperation prepares for the impulse-attitude-work, emotions are necessary because play is. But impulse is the gold standard of our mental mechanism of exchange. Our wealth is in the unconscious, is organic, and it is our business to invest it productively. Philosophy ought to regard as its normal individuals only those who maintain a sufficient gold reserve fund of spontaneous impulse. Let us have the motor outcomes of innumerable reflex arcs stored up in us as potential energy, to be converted into kinetic volition on the warrants of those controllers of the currency, the relations of right, truth and beauty, as countersigned by the treasurer, our religious ideal. Our play ought to prepare us for work; emotion ought to sustain impulse. We must beware lest our emotional silver become depreciated so that there will be need of a cart-load of sentimentiality to equal a gill of kindness.

Pleasure symbolizes attraction, and pain repulsion; objective sensations symbolize activity and the absence of these leads to quiescence. Now sensation (pleasure, pain and six senses) may run a psychological mechanism, but not even in the lower animals do they so. The instinctive impulses and emotions of many animals are full of implicit relation, biological, psychical, social. The empiricists have always made a mistake in stressing pleasure and pain as

"motives to action." Affective sensations diffuse, but in themselves have no effectiveness, no more than objective sensations have. The affective consciousness occupies a small share of normal life as compared with the healthy, almost toneless, work-period. If our potential energy is being replaced as fast as it becomes kinetic, we expect the diffused coenesthetic emotion to be the result of recreation and therefore to give moderate unobtrusive satisfaction. The great pleasures and the great pains are reflex organic affairs, and will not furnish a basis for philosophy. They are unusual and they have no effectiveness. In extreme cases, the effective sensations paralyze the muscles (become dissociated from effectiveness) and efface consciousness. Nor can philosophy be constructed on the idea that *play* is the goal of life. Play is a preparation for work, for progress, or it has no philosophical meaning. Even the delights of the "aesthetic emotions" are abnormal, harmful, disintegrating, unless they help on that recreation that fits us for work. The rational man would not want to live in a heaven of eternal play. He would ask for the "search for truth," for instance, not to have truth come gurgling down his mental throat. If philosophy, if ethics, wants a *summum bonum* that every normal person can understand, it would not be the "greatest happiness of the greatest number," nor "self-realization," nor "action consonant with law universal," but all of these and more—the most adaptive and expressive work and play that make for the kingdom of heaven. I do not intend to develop this formula, but content myself with adding another ejective (self-objective) maxim: Work for thy living and live for thy work.

The criterion of philosophy is catholic human instinct. When Socrates and his friends had finished their discourses without being able to definitely set forth the essence of courage and wisdom and virtue, he used to say, nevertheless, let us practice them; after Descartes had proved animal automatism satisfactorily to himself, respect for man's relational instincts made him rescue human beings from blank mechanism; when Kant had finished his wonderful feats in the realm of pure reason, he came back to faith and instinct, and exalted spontaneity into a metaphysical principle. The greatest philosophers have been unable to reduce all being to one substance and all relation to one principle because they respected intuition. Some of them have tried to justify the intuitions of God, spontaneity-immortality, some have contented themselves with simple affirmation, some have confessed the impotency of reason to justify them, but all have held to them. The objective lesser lights have given us mechanism, materialism, agnosticism (because we now only "Know in part?"). The subjective logicians have given us mysticism, idealism, pantheism. The lower grade thinkers have set forth eclectic and mixed systems, varying in eclecticism and guess-work. Ejective philosophy, with its object-subject starting point in muscular feeling, and its outward tending work-standard in impulse, strives to investigate the conditions under which truth, beauty and right originate, to set forth its results in empirical terms borrowed from the objectively known (*i.e.*, science), seeks its leading principles in the philosophy of character and religion; it believes that there is a purpose in history and in life, that the deepest intuitions of the human race cannot be illusions; it believes that philosophy, having had centuries of sight, will return to its primitive attitude of faith. But the content of that attitude is very different. The second childhood of philosophy is not of innocence, but of grace; born of need of guiding instincts. Every virile race has its call to the simplicity of nature. But philosophy wants not the simplicity of the savage, but that of earth's

greatest character heroes. Is metaphysic therefore destroyed? I think not. All the sciences have their metaphysic, and philosophy has all the sciences. Skepticism is ruled out, not criticism; materialism and idealism, not physiological psychology and logic, ethics and æsthetics; agnosticism and pantheism, not rationalism and theism. There must be a "synthetic philosophy," but human instinct must judge its results. Above all, do we want a clearing up not only of the "notions" (indeed, some "notions" need critical distinction and others a bodily form), but of the instincts. Ejective philosophy has an effective starting-point and norm, but its criterion is ejective. Of the ejective relations, the æsthetical are the ones that will dominate philosophy; a critique of the æsthetical in nature, in character, in the conceptions of God, immortality and the soul, will, I believe, be a main work of the philosophy of the future. Redintegration, integration, disintegration, habit, law, correspondence with environment, development, character, monism, ideal, type, holiness, fitness, symmetry, harmony—these and many more of like nature are the ideas of the philosophy "that is in the air." Anthropomorphism is becoming æsthetical. As might be expected, theology shows this tendency most plainly: no longer the *Moral Governor*, or the *Righteous Sovereign*, or the *Unknowable Power*; but the Father, who knows and cares about the sparrow's fall, though it must fall; whose sons we are. Religion has ceased to ponder *how* the Father knows or why He cares; it is becoming more and more biological, and, therefore, its ethical life more spontaneous and æsthetical. Men prize spontaneity, but are beginning to say, let the contingent become the necessary, let the necessary be the spontaneous, and the will on earth correspond to the holiness, the completeness of working of the will in heaven. Absolute right is absolute utility; that all may be will-holy, complete, not that we may be happy, though we will be if we fit in with things eternal. Let *cogito, ergo sum* be *fido ergo fui, spero ergo fero, amo ergo sum*.

Let us, therefore, say that ejective philosophy will exalt æsthetical anthropomorphism, and that it will be biological, instinctive, historical and biblical. Biological: Notice the tremendous sweep of these terms (for natural "analyses" are the parables of philosophy)—cell, differentiation, degeneration, environment, survival of the fittest, heredity, conformity to type, etc. Instinctive: Critique of instinct. Duty becomes privilege; "the law" becomes "grace" (the instinct of holiness). Historical: Genesis and history of relations. A certain environment is necessary for their manifestation. A high brain is a necessary environment for a high character. High brain is a new representation of force just as a high character is a new representation of energy. In character development, integration (kinæsthesia of work and consæsthesia of character, both relational, conceptual), self becomes objectified (an apperceptive ejject), a power working for an end set for it. Biblical: Biological, instinctive, historical. Ye work (*final aim*) neither for happiness nor for right, truth and beauty, "but seek ye *first* (*primary attitude*) *his kingdom*, and *his righteousness*; and all these things shall be added unto you (Christ had just before spoken of the lilies of the field).

At the risk of being tiresome and of repeating, let me sum up the whole matter as it appears to me at this moment. "Prove all things; but hold first to that which is good" (Paul the Apostle: I Thess. v. 21, R. V., marginal reading). Let us see if we have not caught hold of some of the most vital things of faith in the wrong way. Let us not "reconcile" by concessions, by eclecticism, but let us

have a critique of pure relational human instinct, our ideal being the perfect one, who called himself THE *Son of Man*. Let us work, build up, find new philosophical relations, ask for "copy" of science and art and life. Let us have all-sided, energy-based, relation-guided anthropomorphism. Let us take hold of intuitionist instinct by an empiricist handle. We side with both intuitionist and empiricist in having philosophy ejective and not effective. Effective philosophy runs into materialism, or into mysticism, or into both, with all grades of abnormality between. Philosophy is representative, and, therefore, it is ejective. Man is not objective (matter) nor subjective (self-feeling), but ejective, self-objective, apperceptive, actively personal, an agent and a steward.

Atheism, agnosticism, pantheism, and the rest of them, are simply tiresome, unesthetic. They fail to help us to work, they fail to explain things because things cannot be explained either objectively or subjectively, but only ejectively, anthropomorphically, in the higher æsthetic sense of the word. Things are explained when they all fit in together with our purest faith and our best work.

If I succeed in suggesting "what is in the (philosophic) air," I shall be satisfied.

15 East Senate Street.

COLUMBIA, S. C., March 11, 1893.